



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,912	01/02/2007	Axel Klatt	102132-32	8069
27388	7590	04/14/2010	EXAMINER	
Hildebrand, Christa			JAMA, ISAAK R	
Norris McLaughlin & Marcus PA			ART UNIT	
875 Third Avenue, 8th Floor			PAPER NUMBER	
New York, NY 10022			2617	
			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			04/14/2010	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/565,912

**Applicant(s)**

KLATT, AXEL

**Examiner**

ISAAK R. JAMA

**Art Unit**

2617

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 01/20/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant argues that the combination of references does not show the limitation of "transmitting more than one mobile radio operator identity, PLMN identity, on a single organization channel BCCH" and "transmitting the more than one PLMN identity in a mobile radio system". However, Examiner disagrees with applicant for the following reasons: (a) Applicant's reason for the references not teaching the limitation is that the Examiner has acknowledged that Kauranen et al is missing the limitation. Also the Applicant is pointing to Park et al in order to argue that the limitation is not taught. However, the Examiner has relied on Park in order to teach the missing limitation of "the PLMN identity is being transmitted in the Master Information Block (MIB) or in System Information Block 1 (SIB1), or in a mobile radio system operating according to the GSM standard on the System Information Type 3 (SI3)" which the applicant has now canceled. In fact, the Examiner is relying on Kauranen in order to show the limitations of "transmitting more than one mobile radio operator identity, PLMN identity, on a single organization channel BCCH" and "transmitting the more than one PLMN identity in a mobile radio system" not Park et al. (b) Further, Kauranen shows a network as shown in FIG. 1 may be shared by several operators, for example as is shown in FIG. 2. In this case, a common RAN 210 can be shared by three different operators, A, B, and C, each operating a Core Network of its own (Core Networks 220, 221, and 222, respectively).

All the Core Networks can be connected to the same RNC of the shared RAN. In the network sharing scenario of FIG. 2, the shared RAN 210 may broadcast the PLMN (Public Land Mobile Network) identity "X" to the terminals, i.e. depending on its capabilities; the terminal may not see the identities of the different Core Network operators. However, it is also possible that the operators have dedicated radio frequencies, whereby they can transmit their own Mobile Network Codes (MNC) on their dedicated carriers (see paragraph 40). Therefore, Examiner contends that the combination of references read upon the limitations of "transmitting more than one mobile radio operator identity, PLMN identity, on a single organization channel BCCH" and "transmitting the more than one PLMN identity in a mobile radio system". Regarding claims 32 and 33, Kauranen shows that a network as shown in FIG. 1 may be shared by several operators, for example as is shown in FIG. 2. In this case, a common RAN 210 can be shared by three different operators, A, B, and C, each operating a Core Network of its own (Core Networks 220, 221, and 222, respectively). Thus reading upon the claims; see also figure 1; element 124. Regarding claims 38, 39, Kauranen shows that the Radio Resource Control (RRC) handles the signaling over the Uu interface and the Radio Access Network Application Part (RANAP) handles the signaling over the lu interface. Regarding claim 40, Kauranen et al show a UMTS system as being used in order to transmit more than one mobile radio operator identity. Regarding claims 41, 42, 43 and 46, Kauranen shows the Core Networks can be connected to the same RNC of the shared RAN. In the network sharing scenario of FIG. 2, the shared RAN 210 may broadcast the PLMN (Public Land Mobile Network) identity "X" to the terminals, i.e.

depending on its capabilities; the terminal may not see the identities of the different Core Network operators. However, it is also possible that the operators have dedicated radio frequencies, whereby they can transmit their own Mobile Network Codes (MNC) on their dedicated carriers (see paragraph 40). Therefore, Examiner contends that the combination of references read upon the limitations of "transmitting more than one mobile radio operator identity, PLMN identity, on a single organization channel BCCH" and "transmitting the more than one PLMN identity in a mobile radio system". Regarding claim 53, Kauranen shows a common RAN 210 can be shared by three different operators, A, B, and C, each operating a Core Network of its own (Core Networks 220, 221, and 222, respectively). All the Core Networks can be connected to the same RNC of the shared RAN. In the network sharing scenario of FIG. 2, the shared RAN 210 may broadcast the PLMN (Public Land Mobile Network) identity "X" to the terminals, i.e. depending on its capabilities; the terminal may not see the identities of the different Core Network operators. Regarding claims 59, 61, 60 and 62; Park et al is used to show the limitations as described previously on columns 21 and 22, lines 66-67 and 1).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 30-41, 44-55 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0162077 (Kauranen et al.).
4. Regarding claims 30, 33, 34, 41 and 49, Kauranen teaches a method for providing or sharing or jointly using a mobile radio access network by several mobile radio providers **[Figure 2, RAN # 210 and core network operators 220, 221 and 222]**, comprising the steps of providing a single radio access network for jointly use by several mobile radio providers **[Figure 2, RAN # 210]**, wherein for differentiating between a core networks of the different mobile radio providers, the respective identity of the network operator (PLMN identity) is provided in the radio access network (RAN or BSS) to the mobile radio subscriber by transmitting more than one mobile radio operator identity, PLMN identity **[Page 3, paragraph 0040]**, in addition, Kauranen further teaches that the core network further includes a circuit-switched domain for processing, for example, voice calls and a packet-switched domain for supporting bursty, high speed data transfers such as, for example, e-mail messages and web browsing **[Column 3, lines 6-10]**. But Kauranen does not specifically teach that the PLMN

identity is being transmitted in the Master Information Block (MIB) or in System Information Block 1 (SIB1), or in a mobile radio system operating according to the GSM standard on the System Information Type 3 (SI3). Park teaches a method and apparatus for interfacing among mobile terminal, base station and core network in mobile telecommunications system whereby a PLMN identity the RNC sends the system information message having a master information block (MIB) to the hybrid type asynchronous terminal over a BCCH [Columns 21 and 22, lines 66-67 & 1]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the method of Park in the system of Kauranen in order to implement the GSM standard.

5. Regarding claim 31, Kauranen further teaches that network elements of the core network (Core Network, for example MSC and/or GSN) required for providing the mobile radio services are separately provided by each of the mobile radio providers [Figure 1, # 120].

6. Regarding claim 32, Kauranen further teaches that the method network elements of the core network are used for providing voice connections (MSC) [Figure 1, # 120], whereas other network elements for providing IP connections (packet network, GSN) are each provided by the different operators [Figure 1, # 124].

7. Regarding claims 35 and 36, Kauranen further teaches that when a connection is requested, the subscriber/the subscriber terminal notifies the radio access network of the different core networks or PLMNs with which the connection is to be set up [Column 4, lines 38-44].

8. Regarding claims 37 - 40, Kauranen further teaches that when a connection is requested, the subscriber/the subscriber terminal notifies the radio access network of the different core networks with which the connection is to be set up, and that this notification occurs with the transmission of the network operator ID (for example PLMN ID) in the RRC CONNECTION REQUEST or the INITIAL DIRECT TRANSFER message in a mobile radio system operating according to the UMTS standard, wherein only the MCC of the PLMN identity is transmitted. **[Figure 3, Page 3, paragraphs 0041 & 0042].**
9. Regarding claim 44, Kauranen further teaches that more than one mobile radio network operator ID (PLMN ID) is transmitted to a subscriber terminal in a mobile radio network operating according to the UMTS or GSM standard **[Page 3, paragraphs 0043].**
10. Regarding claims 45-48, Kauranen further teaches that additional mobile network operator IDs (e.g., PLMN IDs) and hence of network operators, which the subscriber terminal is potentially permitted to use, and transmitted through dedicated signaling between radio access network or core network and the subscriber terminal **[Page 3, paragraphs 0040].**
11. Regarding claims 50 and 55, Kauranen further teaches that at least one of the mobile radio networks comprises a core network element (MSC or GSN) for CS and PS connections and a radio network control unit (RNC or BSC), wherein one radio network control unit (RNC or BSC) is connected with more than one respective core network element (MSC or GSN) for CS and PS connections **[Figure 1, # 120].**



12. Regarding claims 51 and 52, Kauranen further teaches one radio access network (RAN) is connected with more than one SGSN (for the PS domain), and one radio access network (RAN) is connected with more than one MSC (for the CS domain)

**[Figure 1, #s 20, 22, 34 and 36].**

13. Regarding claim 53, Kauranen further teaches the selection of the PLMN or of these core network elements (MSC or GSN) is based on signaling the selection by the subscriber terminal, in particular based on the signaled PLMN ID **[Figures 1 & 2, # 120; i.e. Figure 1, #120 shows one core network and Figure 2, #s 220-222 show three core networks, meaning that core network pieces 121-125 are also present in core networks 220-222].**

14. Regarding claim 54, Kauranen further teaches that the provided single radio access network operates according to the UMTS, CDMA 2,000, or GSM standard **[Page 2, paragraph 0036].**

15. Regarding claim 57, Kauranen further teaches the actual location to the mobile radio network is for moving subscriber terminals, through location registration procedures **[Figure 1, HLR # 125].**

16. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 7,236,784 (Kauranen et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Number 7,110,788 (Park et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,119,000 (Stephenson et al.).

17. Regarding claims 42 and 43, Kauranen and Park has been discussed above with regard to claim 30. But Kauranen does not specifically teach that a signal represented,

for example, by a single bit is transmitted on the organization channel (BCCH) of the radio access network to indicate if the radio network resources administration unit (RCN and/or BSC) provides the connection request of the subscriber/the subscriber terminal with one of the core networks based on the IMSI of the subscriber terminal ("default" selection based on the subscriber IMSI). Stephenson teaches a method and apparatus for tracking identity-code changes in a communications system [Title] whereby the IMSI of a subscriber is held in a subscriber identity module (SIM) that plugs into a mobile station. Each time the mobile station accesses the PLMN, the IMSI held in the associated SIM is provided to the PLMN (either directly, or indirectly in the form of a TMSI as will be explained below). The IMSI allows the PLMN to access the HLR where the subscriber is registered to retrieve subscriber-specific data and to record the MSC in whose area the mobile station is currently located, according to context [Page 3, paragraph 0027]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the method of Stephenson in the system of Kauranen in order to account for connections to foreign networks.

18. Claim 56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 7,236,784 (Kauranen et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,741,868 (Park et al.), and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0068565 (Purnadi et al.).

19. Regarding claim 56, Kauranen has been discussed above in regard to claim 46. But Kauranen fails to teach that the service is in the context of "PDP context activation". Purnadi teaches a new session or handoff methods in wireless networks [Title], if a

DRS (data ready-to-send) option in the Vendor Specific Extension field in the All Registration Request is not included, WGW (wireless gateway) initiates the GPRS Attach procedure immediately followed by GPRS PDP Context Activation [**Page 4, paragraph 0048**]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the method of Purnadi in the system of Kauranen in order to implements the UMTS standard.

20. Claims 59-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0162077 (Kauranen et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,741,868 (Park et al.).

21. Regarding claims 59-62, Kauranen has been discussed above in regard to claims 30 and 58. But Kauranen does not specifically teach that the PLMN identity is being transmitted in the Master Information Block (MIB) or in System Information Block 1 (SIB1), or in a mobile radio system operating according to the GSM standard on the System Information Type 3 (SI3). Park teaches a method and apparatus for interfacing among mobile terminal, base station and core network in mobile telecommunications system whereby a PLMN identity the RNC sends the system information message having a master information block (MIB) to the hybrid type asynchronous terminal over a BCCH [**Columns 21 and 22, lines 66-67 & 1**]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the method of Park in the system of Kauranen in order to implement the GSM standard.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISAAC R. JAMA whose telephone number is (571)270-5887. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday; 4-10.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester G. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/IRJ/

/LESTER KINCAID/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617